

**SPECIAL MEETING  
MINUTES  
BROWN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY  
Friday, November 30, 2012, 11:45 a.m.  
City Hall, 100 N. Jefferson Street, Room 604  
Green Bay, WI 54301**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Tom Diedrick–Chair, Rich Aicher–Vice-Chair, Darlene Hallet, Ann Hartman

**MEMBER ABSENT:** Sup. Andy Nicholson

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Rob Strong, Robyn Hallet, DonElla Payne, Dawn DeWitt, Phyllis Schmidt, Chuck LaMine, Dan Robinson

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

No minutes were received prior to the special meeting.

**COMMUNICATIONS:**

R. Hallet reported on an email sent from Noel Halvorsen of NeighborWorks Green Bay concerning the project-based vouchers. She summarized the email in which N. Halvorsen requested that NeighborWorks be considered for the project-based vouchers. He expressed that NeighborWorks had previously approached the Housing Authority with its interest in project basing some of their units. At that time, the Housing Authority did not pursue an RFP, so NeighborWorks would like to be considered in the RFP this time. N. Halvorsen was unable to attend this meeting, but P. Schmidt is at the meeting from NeighborWorks and will be available for questions.

T. Diedrick stated that NeighborWorks is welcome to submit a response to the current RFP, or they could also take this up as a specific agenda item at a future meeting.

D. Hallet added that it appears from the email that NeighborWorks would like to add units. P. Schmidt responded that their request is to add eight units; six from February and two more they recently acquired. All eight were vacant, foreclosed properties which are rehabilitated. Two units are currently economically occupied, but NeighborWorks would like the Project-Based Vouchers to make administration of these rentals a little easier. She added that because BCHA staff is so busy, they could have those eight units added via the existing RFP rather than creating a separate RFP.

R. Hallet added that when they get to this portion of the agenda, she has a suggestion that would allow NeighborWorks or anyone else to submit a proposal. The RFP allows the Housing Authority to accept more than one proposal and does not specify an exact total number of units.

T. Diedrick added that another concern is the BCHA's commitment to Scattered Site housing rather than project-based housing. R. Strong responded that NeighborWorks could submit a proposal. BCHA expects a submission from Cardinal Capital for the veterans' housing and will review all proposals received to determine those that are worthy of project-basing units. He noted that NeighborWorks' proposal might rank lower compared to the other proposals because it is not veterans' housing, but they could at least submit their proposal for review. That would be the appropriate time to further discuss NeighborWorks' proposal.

**REPORTS:**

None

**OLD BUSINESS:**

1. Review and approval of revisions to Chapter 17 (Project-Based Vouchers) of the Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan

R. Hallet stated that changes to Chapter 17 of the Administrative Plan were approved at the last meeting, but there are some additional adjustments recommended that change the timeframe to advertise the RFP. The staff felt that the timeframe in the existing language was unnecessary.

R. Strong added that they are not aware of any federal requirements, but they do have to establish a local policy. The process that has been set in place seems burdensome, so the proposed revised process is one publication with a minimum of seven days before receiving proposals and evaluating them. Changing this would allow quicker turnaround for the project.

R. Aicher asked if there was any concern regarding the 2006 NanMcKay copyright. R. Hallet responded that the BCHA purchased the NanMcKay model administrative plan which they use as the baseline for the BCHA Administrative Plan and allows for modifications and customizations.

A motion was made by D. Hallet and seconded by R. Aicher to approve the changes to Chapter 17 of the Administrative Plan. Motion carried.

2. Discussion and possible action regarding BCHA RFP to project base approximately 50 vouchers for veteran housing

R. Hallet noted that the hardcopy in the meeting packet has been revised a bit from the version that was emailed out. She then went on to summarize the RFP. The first paragraph describes what the intention is – that the BCHA is requesting an RFP for project-based vouchers that include housing and services for families that include a U.S. military veteran. The ranking in this process would be such that entities that do not necessarily serve as veterans could still apply but would receive a lower ranking.

The next part in the RFP is a description of the Project-Based Voucher Program that states that they will accept proposals for both existing housing and new construction. The bullet points indicate the types of housing that are not eligible for Project-Based Vouchers. Generally, Project-Based Vouchers cannot exceed 25% of total units in the building; however, there is an exception for projects for elderly and disabled populations and for those that provide supportive services. The site must meet the goal of de-concentration and must not be involved with any discriminatory practices and must also have accessibility features. HQS will be taken into consideration along with regulations for site and neighborhood standards.

The RFP also addresses how new construction must comply with HQS. The BCHA will enter into a HAP contract with the owners that are selected. The owner is responsible for screening and selection of tenants. The income eligibility percentage has been changed from the version emailed earlier. Instead of 75% of families approved for tenancy meeting income limits of 30% of the median income, now all families must meet 50% of the median income limit. R. Strong added that it should read “at or below 50% median income”; this was noted and changed. R. Hallet added that the RFP states that the utility allowances were attached as an exhibit. She realizes there is not an attachment but will add one that will be labeled Exhibit E.

R. Aicher asked R. Hallet about the three bullet points referring to the rent to owner and inquired if the 110% of fair market rent was accurate. R. Hallet responded that it was, explaining that the subsidy standards for Project-Based Vouchers are a little different from regular vouchers’ payment standards; Project-Based Vouchers are strictly 110% of the current fair market rent.

R. Hallet went on to explain that the application review panel indicates that the executive director will appoint a review panel. The application review section discusses how the BCHA will review the applications and what some of the criteria will include.

The bullet points on Pages 3 and 4 indicate requirements that need to be included in the proposals. The suggestion she had mentioned earlier would be to eliminate the last bullet point that currently states that the units must house and provide services for veterans and instead use that criteria only as a ranking criteria, which would allow entities who do not necessarily serve veterans to still submit a proposal and meet eligibility requirements. She is proposing to remove the bullet point entirely and only keep that in the ranking criteria. R. Strong added that if this is kept in, the NeighborWorks proposal would not be eligible. T. Diedrick added that if other projects are being taken on, they might be pressing the Scattered Site issue. R. Hallet responded that this could address Scattered Site but doesn’t have to; it is neutral. D. Payne asked how removing the bullet point would impact the 25% cap. R. Hallet re-read the section at the top of Page 2,

indicating that the 25% cap does not include housing for elderly or disabled families, housing providing supportive services, or single family homes, which is defined as one to four units.

R. Strong added that there are references throughout the document explaining that this proposal targets veterans' housing. Removing this bullet point adds more flexibility and does not automatically disqualify an entity that does not necessarily house or service veterans. T. Diedrick added that it would give the BCHA and the commission the opportunity to look at other options and possibilities as well.

R. Hallet then continued to overview the RFP. The review and ranking criteria are laid out, and the BCHA may choose to select more than one proposal or may reject all proposals. There is also legal language that needed to be included but is non-specific to this particular type of proposal. The RFP then goes into the submission deadlines, format, addresses non-responsive and non-compliant applications, and application content.

R. Hallet then summarized the attached exhibits. Exhibit A includes the project-based subsidy standards. It was noted that the exhibit still said 2009 but this would be updated to 2012. Exhibit B is the public notice that the BCHA would publish. Exhibit C is the selection criteria for existing units to ensure that existing units meet all of the stated criteria. Exhibit D is the selection criteria which include accessibility for disabled individuals, onsite services, financial capacity of the applicant, eligibility of residents, management experience, general living quality, and condition of the property.

The last page is the schedule which indicates the publication, review, and selection dates for proposals.

C. LaMine expressed appreciation to the staff and the Housing Authority for their work in reviewing and bringing this forward. He added that they have had good progress working with Cardinal Capital. He anticipates approval of the offer purchase by December 19.

A motion was made by D. Hallet and seconded by A. Hartman to approve the RFP as amended. Motion carried.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

None

**INFORMATIONAL:**

None

**BILLS:**

None

**FINANCIAL REPORT:**

None

**STAFF REPORT:**

None

A motion was made by D. Hallet and seconded by R. Aicher to adjourn. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 12:16 p.m.

mnr:rah:ejns